

2. A

THE ARGUMENTS
ADVANCED AGAINST
THE
ENFRANCHISEMENT OF THE JEWS,
CONSIDERED IN
A SERIES OF LETTERS.
BY
FRANCIS HENRY GOLDSMID.

LONDON:
COLBURN AND BENTLEY, NEW BURLINGTON STREET.

1831.

Geo. H. 53.5.
482.

STADTBIBLIOTHEK
FRANKFURT AM MAIN.

RICHARD TAYLOR,
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

THE ARGUMENTS,

&c.

LETTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

WHEN, early in the last year, it was proposed to relieve the British Jews, (of whose community I am a member,) from their legal disabilities, it was not expected that it would be necessary to bring the subject a second time before the Legislature or the public. The desired measure had so little in its nature, that seemed likely to alarm the closest imitator of the Barons of Merton, the staunchest opposer of “change in the laws of England” ;—both Houses of Parliament had so solemnly sanctioned the principles of religious liberty by the measures of the two preceding Sessions ;—the Government seemed so far to have pledged itself to these principles, as well by its act of bringing forward the Catholic Relief Bill, as by expressing in the most comprehensive terms, on that

and on other occasions, its dislike of *all* civil distinctions on account of belief—and further, the organs, both public and private, from which its intentions may usually be ascertained, had so generally assumed either a friendly or an indifferent tone respecting the claims of the Jews :—that any very serious opposition to our wishes, was a thing regarded as impossible by the most experienced among our advocates.

The first debate, and the division which succeeded it, without completely fulfilling these auguries, did not, however, prove them to be wholly erroneous ; for although some of those who had contended to the last against the claims of the Catholics, avowed at once an equal determination to disregard the prayer of the Jewish community ; and although a member of the Ministry (which the best informed still believe to have retained, almost up to the latest hour, its intention to be neutral,) expressed an opinion, that the work of removing restrictions upon conscience ought not to be too rapidly completed ;—yet the first reading of our “Relief Bill” was carried.

But now, from some not wholly ascertained causes, the scene again changed. Perhaps opposition to any measure, however innocent, which might be for the

first time submitted to the House of Commons, was regarded by the Cabinet as a necessary duty—perhaps it was discovered, that prejudices too strong to be disregarded, (but which, under new auspices, are, probably, no longer felt,) were entertained in the highest places, by the most exalted members of the higher rank of society, with which we have generally far less intercourse than with the middle classes, and where, consequently, erroneous opinions more often exist respecting us. The result, however, was, that the Government exchanged its early indifference for resolute hostility—that it made a general gathering of its forces—that many who, while the Ministry was neutral, had privately, but unambiguously, declared themselves our friends, flocked around its standard, which they knew not how to desert—and that the Bill was lost.

And yet, severe as was the disappointment, which this denial of redress occasioned to the Jews—deeply as it taught them to feel the pain of “hope deferred”—the defeat was not unattended with its consolatory circumstances. It was consoling to reflect, that of the district where persons of our faith are best known, because more than half the Jews of the kingdom reside there—of the three divisions of the metropolis

namely, and the two counties in which it stands—the twelve representatives, without a single exception, had voted in favour of the rejected Bill. It was consoling that the measure, though encountered by the whole weight of Government influence, had united in its support a minority, the most numerous of the session*, and among the most distinguished for the great names which it comprised. But, above all, it was matter of satisfaction, that the arguments advanced by the most able of our opponents, were not such as can long engage the attention, or influence the resolutions, of reasonable men.

On some of these arguments, which had been anticipated, remarks were placed before the public previously to the introduction of Mr. Grant's Bill ; on others, during the interval which elapsed between that occurrence and its rejection ; almost all, again, were amply discussed, and triumphantly refuted, by our Parliamentary supporters. I should occupy to little purpose the time of my readers, if I filled the following pages with a reply to reasoning to which sufficient replies have already been repeatedly given. I shall therefore confine myself to answering, in a few short Letters, such of the objections to the Re-

* 165 voted, and 20 paired off, for the second reading.

lief of the Jews, as have either been urged in more quarters than one, or as appear to have been considered less at large than the rest, by our eloquent advocates in Parliament. In doing this, I trust that I shall have done enough, since there is ground for concluding, that no other objections than these can have made the slightest impression on the minds of any portion of our fellow-citizens.

LETTER II.

REPLY TO THE OBJECTION, THAT THE JEWS ARE IN CONSTANT EXPECTATION OF THEIR RETURN TO PALESTINE.

ACCORDING to the plan proposed, I proceed to consider the principal objections advanced against the Jews' Relief Bill ; and shall first advert to those, which are founded on certain opinions, either forming, or erroneously supposed to form, part of the Jewish faith. In examining these, I shall not inquire, whether the tenets of the Hebrew community may seem highly unreasonable to persons of a different creed, but simply whether they be such, as may be expected, or are found, to unfit those who profess them from performing, as ably and faithfully as other men, the functions of citizens. As soon as we lose sight of this single question, we wander from political into religious controversy ; beyond this, the belief of the Jews has no connection with the matter at issue.

Firstly, then, It is asserted that the sons of Israel regard the coming of the Messiah and their restoration to the promised land as certain events, which may at any moment dissolve their relations with the

various countries through which they are dispersed ; and that this anticipation must lead the English Jews, (if they be taken as an example,) to consider themselves as mere sojourners in their birth-place ; must deprive them of all motives for firm attachment to England ; and make them incapable of the feelings, and therefore unworthy of the rights and privileges, of Englishmen.

Now, it is undoubtedly true, that the Jews regard the coming of the Messiah, and their own restoration to the promised land, as certain events. But the inference, that this anticipation renders them incapable of love for their native land, or unfit to serve it, is disproved, (as I shall have occasion to state more at length in a subsequent Letter,) by the experience of every age and country, in which the writers of their history have informed us that they have been *treated* like citizens ; or rather, in which these writers have recorded their existence, without recording their sufferings under persecution.

And here my answer to the *first* objection, and indeed to all others, that are derived from the peculiar tenets of the Jews, might end ; for the effects which theory points out as necessarily resulting, but which practice shows never to result, from particular opi-

nions, can scarcely deserve much attention from legislators.—Let us, however, further see, whether we may not arrive at the conclusion, that the inference adverted to is false, even without the aid of experience; and for this purpose let us again take England as our example.

The most general, rational, and powerful of the causes, which inspire an Englishman with love for his country, and sympathy in its interests and glory, are early associations; and the reflection, that in it those whom he loves are found; that its laws protect him and them; and that its institutions afford to him a large proportion of those liberties and franchises, of which his enjoyment is consistent with good government and social order. Now all these causes, except one, operate as powerfully on an English Jew as on other Englishmen. He too is bound by early recollections to his country; it contains those who are dear to him; its Government protects him and them; and if its laws refuse to him all those franchises and privileges which their other subjects possess, they leave him at least the hope—and it is a hope which will not easily be renounced—of totally altering in this respect his situation. All motives, therefore, except that which springs from the consciousness of po-

litical liberty, the Jew already shares with those who surround him.

Surely, then, he has ground to complain of the endeavours made to persuade his fellow-citizens, that all these motives are rendered powerless, because his religion teaches him to anticipate, that a miraculous change, which will put an end to the connection of his race with England, will at some period during the existence of the world occur. But, it will be said, you admit yourselves your belief, that every instant *may* terminate your interest in the welfare of your native land.—And do we then differ in this respect from men of other creeds? Many Christians, I imagine, look forward to a second advent of the Messiah, as to an event, on the happening of which all distinctions of states and nations will be forgotten throughout the globe, or at least the aggrandisement of any particular nation can no longer be an object of the wishes of any reasonable being. All Christians, as I believe, are convinced that the human race itself must one day cease to be. And all, certainly, of whatever creed, expect the close, which may arrive during the passing hour, and cannot be deferred many years, of their mortal existence.—Now every one of these events—death, the extinction of the human species,

and the commencement of a Millennium—will, when it shall occur, render unimportant to each citizen the advantage of his country, or his own individual prosperity; and therefore, the same process of reasoning by which it is attempted to prove that the Jews want patriotism, would lead to the inference, that men by whom any one of these events is anticipated, must of necessity be indifferent to all temporal things, and unfit to be entrusted with the direction of them.

And yet it has not been found in practice, that the predictions of religion, or the conclusions of reason, have made the inhabitants of this or of any other land culpably inattentive to their public or their private welfare. Nor is it difficult to perceive the cause. Reason and Christianity, whilst they point to different changes, which will convert all that interests us *now* and *here* into matters of no moment, either wholly or in part omit to assign to those changes their respective periods, and thus make the prospect of them utterly incapable to destroy the force of the motives, always present and always active, that urge men to desire their own prosperity, and that of the state to which they belong.

Just so it is with the Jews. The Jewish religion also teaches ideas of the future, which might possibly,

if she declared the moment of their fulfilment to be fixed and at hand, tend to quench in the minds of her votaries the love of country ; but which have not, and cannot have, any such effect, because she leaves the period when her predictions shall be accomplished wholly indefinite—because the devout Jew has no greater reason for supposing, that the re-establishment of his race in Palestine will take place during the next twenty, than that it will be delayed to the end of the next one thousand years.

Nor let the strange assertion be repeated, that the preference, which the Jews have given in many times and places to moveable possessions over landed property, and of which some slight traces still remain, proves the influence which the anticipation, however distant, of that event, exercises over their conduct, and of their unwillingness to bind themselves to any country. It is impossible not to see the real cause of such a preference. In earlier ages it has arisen from the persecutions, which drove them during centuries from kingdom to kingdom, and more recently from hereditary habits, and in England from the fact, that the possession of land does not confer on Jews the same privileges as on other persons—on the humbler the right to be represented, or on the more

wealthy, eligibility to represent. From these things we may sufficiently learn, why the Jews are less anxious than others to be landholders, without resorting to the hypothesis, that they constantly consider how they shall so order their worldly estate, that they may best take advantage of a *miraculous* event, and enjoy the equally *miraculous* happiness that is to result from it.

No! there is nothing in the religious expectations of the Hebrews, that can diminish their attachment to their native country; there is no circumstance that can cause the Jews of England to feel that attachment less strongly than their fellow-citizens:—none, except the existence of the disabling statutes, which make them, if not actually, yet by comparison, a body of slaves amidst a nation of freemen.

LETTER III.

REPLY TO THE OBJECTIONS, THAT THE JEWS CONSIDER
THEMSELVES AS A SEPARATE NATION, AND THAT THEIR
RELIGION FORBIDS THEIR POLITICAL IDENTIFICATION
WITH THE STATE IN WHICH THEY LIVE.

My last Letter has, I believe, sufficiently proved, that the religious expectations of the Jew can never diminish his desire to promote the happiness of his country.

But it is further said, that the Jewish faith condemns any such desire, teaches the Hebrews to regard themselves as *a separate nation*, and pronounces impious all efforts on their part to advance the welfare of any other state than future Palestine. Nay, some of our opponents have gone so far as to admit, that their unfavourable decision was grounded on this single consideration—that the Jews have always held themselves to be *a separate people*.

It is certainly true, that the Hebrews continue often to assume this denomination, which Scripture in ancient times more appropriately bestowed upon them. But it is only necessary to examine, with a little atten-

tion, the sense in which the phrase alluded to is really employed by them, in order to be satisfied that the use of it implies no opinion, which can render them less worthy of the privileges of British subjects. When the term is applied to the past or to the future, its signification is obvious. Applied to the past, it recalls the fact, that they formed of old a separate state, distinct from the Pagan tribes by which they were surrounded, in the Holy Land. Applied to the future, it denotes their belief, that they will be again miraculously re-established as a nation. But has the phrase, which it is justly said that the Jews employ, any *present* meaning? Does it signify that they have *now* any national existence? that, although scattered through various lands in every part of the world, so that those of one place are often ignorant of the very being of their co-religionists in the remotest quarter of the globe, they do nevertheless *at this moment* form one great political whole?

No religion can force men, and certainly the religion of the Jews does not require them, to give credence to any thing which, like this, is directly contrary to known and simple fact.

The Jews are assured that they have been, and will again be, a nation.—That their anticipations of

the future, do not unfit them for the duties of citizens, I trust I have shown in a former Letter. That their belief in facts recorded by Scripture can have no such effect will, I suppose, be admitted. To no other things than these, can the appellation of *a nation*, which is sometimes assumed by them, refer. They do not, as seems to have been imagined, they cannot, believe, that they have now any political existence or political interest distinct from those of the country in which they live. It is impossible to understand the nature, the meaning, of such an existence or such an interest. And yet positive proof that the Jews entertain the belief ascribed to them, could alone excuse the cruel exclusions, for which the almost gratuitous and unintelligible imputation of that belief is pleaded as a sufficient apology.

But again, it is objected that the religion of the Jews declares, that it is in them absolute impiety to unite themselves as citizens with the state in which they live, and to make its welfare an object of their exertions. To this assertion I shall oppose a positive denial, that any such doctrines as these are comprised in the Jewish faith. If they are indeed comprised in it, where are they to be found? The Jews disclaim them. Among the almost innumerable passages

of Scripture which foretel our dispersion, I am not aware that *any* are to be found, which direct us to avoid political identification with the people among which we may be placed, or to shrink from performing *one* of the duties of faithful subjects. And further, if it be supposed that the pious Jew, instead of being satisfied, as in truth he would be, with the absence of any doctrines condemning the desire to be useful to his country, should anxiously seek some further token, from which he might infer that his religion sanctioned so natural a feeling, before he ventured to indulge it; I do not perceive that he could rely upon any higher authority, than the conduct of the Prophets during the first captivity. And this will teach him, that to serve the state and government which protect him, is a duty, not a crime: for Jeremiah more than once enjoined cheerful submission to Babylon; and Nehemiah and Daniel were ministers and servants of Babylonian and Persian kings.

These things can scarcely have been considered by those among our opponents, who have actually warned us in a tone of some solemnity, that by accepting the boon which we seek, we should desert the sacred principles of our ancestors.—The *Grecian*

gift of advice from enemies has always a somewhat suspicious appearance. But when we find, as we do here, that we are counselled to shun as irreligious the performance of civil functions and duties, which were recommended and performed by the inspired teachers of our religion themselves, we are surely entitled to assume the office of counsellors in our turn.

We are entitled to say; Do you make yourselves better acquainted with the principles of our faith before you attempt to expound them; and consider in the mean time whether it be consistent with *your* religion,—the religion, as you declare it to be, of peace and love,—to inflict upon men hardships that you can only excuse, by imputing to them principles directly contrary to those which they really entertain.

Chur
10.

LETTER IV.

REPLY TO THE ASSERTION, THAT WHERE ENFRANCHISEMENT HAS BEEN GRANTED TO THE JEWS, IT HAS BEEN OF LITTLE PRACTICAL UTILITY.

THE modes of reasoning have been examined by which it has been endeavoured to deduce, from false ideas or representations respecting the tenets of the Jews, the conclusion, that the removal of their disabilities could be in no degree beneficial to the State.

I proceed to an objection, stranger at least, if it cannot be more erroneous. The public have been informed, that from such a measure there could result *no practical advantage to the Jews themselves*, since their religion, (which, it must be remarked, does not prevent them from desiring,) would prevent them from discharging civil offices and trusts, and with a view to prove this position, which admits indeed of no other proof, it has actually been stated that the countries, whose laws have placed their Jewish subjects on an equal footing with the rest, furnish only a very few solitary instances, in which persons

of that class have exercised the privileges thus laid open to *them* in common with their fellow-citizens.

In order to show that this assertion derives its origin from the defective information alone of the assertors, I shall advert to the state of the Jews in the different countries, where, ~~since their expulsion from Palestine~~ ^{their} their belief has not been made a ⁽¹⁰⁾ ground of punishment.—My readers have no cause to apprehend, that in doing this I shall exercise their patience by alluding to many and various portions of history, or by producing a long list of liberal states. Few are the lands, and in all instances save one, recent the periods, which form exceptions, (a Hebrew may call them the bright exceptions,) to the general rule of persecuting exclusion.

In Spain under the Moors ; in France and Holland during the last twenty years ; in Denmark even still more lately ; in the United States since their establishment ;—here alone, at least in Europe and America, has the free exercise of their energies been permitted to the members of the Jewish community. In all these places, however, the result has been precisely such as every unprejudiced man would have anticipated.

When the Moorish dynasty was established in Spain, the Jews, who were very numerous in that

country, and who had previously been reduced to that state of degradation, in which they have usually been found in Christian Europe, were admitted to equal privileges with the Moors themselves. Would you know the consequence? Ask those who desire to represent the Jews as necessarily unfit for any but the humblest employments : and you will be told that such a measure, though it might *nominally* alter the situation of the Hebrews, must have left them practically in their ordinary condition, strangers for the most part to elevating pursuits, and entirely strangers to the service of the State.—Ask History, and *She* will tell you, that the Jews of Spain employed their talents equally with their fellow-citizens for the advantage of their country, that they rose to high stations in its camps and councils, that more than one sovereign chose ministers from among them, and that they might at the same time boast of names illustrious for acquirements in letters and philosophy. My readers will not, I trust, be reminded without pity and regret, that after the restoration of Christian kings to the sovereignty of Spain, (although some of these kings were themselves ably and faithfully served by their Jewish subjects,) yet the lot of a body of men thus worthy of protection, was gradually changed

from religious liberty to thralldom, and from thralldom to exile.

After leaving the Oasis, which I have just described, in the desert of persecution, we pass through an interval of six centuries, and cross the Atlantic, before we again find a place and a period, in which political rights have been conceded to the Jews. But whether in Spain or in North America, in the twelfth or in the eighteenth century, there was no cause to doubt that freedom of conscience would be hailed as a blessing by those who had been before deprived of it, and that Hebrews, like other men, would avail themselves of the advantages which it confers. That this has been eminently the case with the Jews of the United States, who are supposed not to equal in numbers one-third of those of Great Britain, is shown by the many instances where they have embraced the occupations, and have been thought deserving of the trusts, opened to them by the removal of disabling laws. In that country, Jews have been members of Congress and of the legislatures of the different States, magistrates and law-officers employed by the Government, leading members of Corporations, principal magistrates of cities, and in numerous cases have held commissions in the army and navy. Not one of these stations

could a Jew have filled, without a mean and impious disavowal of his belief, if statutes imposing tests, such as those which oppress us in England, had been in force in the United States. And yet we are told that the non-existence of such statutes has produced to the Jews of America *no practical benefit* !

In other countries, where the oppression of those who are not Christians has not been deemed a necessary part of Christianity, the result has been the same. With respect to the condition of the Jews in France, the want of acquaintance with any person resident there, who has paid attention to the subject, has indeed prevented me from obtaining any detailed statement. But a few facts may be mentioned, which will throw sufficient light upon our present inquiry. Many French Jews are magistrates, many military officers ; a Jew was for some years Mayor of Paris. Nor is it an uninteresting circumstance, that several persons of the Hebrew faith fell in the combats of last July, against the troops of Charles X., and thus contributed their lives to the refutation of the calumny, which declares Jews incapable to appreciate, and therefore unworthy to enjoy, the blessings of constitutional liberty.

“ Since the constituent assembly has placed the

Israelites on the same footing with other citizens," said the French Minister for Public Instruction, a few weeks since, in the Chamber of Deputies *, "*they have partaken of our glory and our misfortunes ; their blood has flowed on the same fields of battle as ours ; their children have been brought up in the same schools as those of their Christian brethren ; they have imbibed the same principles, adopted the same habits, and become most deserving members of the State."*

Among the Danish Jews, whose number does not exceed four thousand, a marked improvement has taken place since their emancipation. Very many devote themselves to scientific pursuits, and several fill situations under Government.

In Holland, where the Jews are numerous, they are to be found in every profession, and hold offices of almost every description. Mr. Assur was for many years Secretary to the Minister of Justice, or, if I may use an English term completely analogous, Under Secretary of State. There are many Jewish barristers. Jews have been, and are, members of Corporations, deputies in the States General, and magis-

* Morning Herald of Monday, December 6, 1830. (See the speech of the Minister, and that of another Deputy, in the Appendix, No. I.)

trates of every different rank from assistant justices of the peace up to chief judge, and members of the principal tribunals.

With Holland ends the catalogue of countries where true liberty of conscience has been or is enjoyed by the Jews.—My brief review of its effects upon them has shown, that in all these countries they have followed the same professions, and have approved themselves worthy of the same places of trust and dignity, as their fellow-citizens ; and that these instances have been more or less numerous, either as the number of the Jews has been greater or smaller, or as the duration of their enfranchisement has been longer or less extensive. If, on the other hand, the evil consequences of their admission to political rights be sought, the search will be vain.

Such are the facts, which I submit to our opponents, and which I leave them to reconcile with their position, that to relieve the Jews of England from their legal disqualifications would be to confer no solid and sensible advantage upon that community itself.

It was in truth a strange error, which led those who resist our claims to affirm, that experience proved the truth of their arguments. If the discussion had been confined to theoretic reasoning, it might have

been possible that they should persuade such as did not bestow upon the subject sufficient attention, by ingenious sophistry. But since they have appealed to experience, and since the clear and uniform result of experience declares them to be wrong, who shall longer defend their doctrines ?*

* Most of the facts here mentioned are drawn from Mr. Van Oven's recently published "Appeal to the British Nation on behalf of the Jews," where original authorities are copiously cited. (See also the Appendix to this Pamphlet, No. II.)

LETTER V.

REMARKS ON PARTIAL ENFRANCHISEMENT.

Conclusion.

FROM the speeches that have been delivered, and the very few articles in magazines and newspapers that have been written, in opposition to the claims of the Jews, I have been unable to extract any argument besides those discussed in the foregoing pages, on which it seemed possible that a remark might be required.

But before I close these letters, I may be permitted to make a few observations on a species of compromise which was proposed in Parliament, by those who resisted, to those who supported the prayer of our petitions, but of which indeed the terms were not very clearly defined. Among the members of the Legislature, who clung with fond affection to the last relic of disqualifying laws, some extended their liberality only so far as to consent to open to us the practice of the law, and offices in Corporations ; whilst others were willing to admit us also to situations of

trust and to judicial stations, but were desirous still to exclude us from Parliament.

In order to estimate these offers at their proper value, it may be necessary to consider, that the mischief produced by religious tests is of two kinds. The laws that impose such tests inflict injury upon individuals by preventing them from engaging in the occupations for which they may be best fitted, and by shutting them out, whatever may be their talents, from the pursuit of public distinctions. The same laws inflict injury upon the whole community which they affect, by making the belief that distinguishes it a matter of punishment, and thus associating with that belief in the general opinion, nay sometimes almost in the minds of those who profess it, the idea of disgrace, or at least of inferiority.

Now by partial relief the evils of the first class would be lessened, but those of the second in no degree diminished. So long as the law shall exclude the Jews from any one office, shall deprive them of any one privilege, which other Dissenters enjoy, it will continue to mark them with a brand, and to make them, as far as any law can have that effect, a dishonoured and degraded caste. If then the Jews complained chiefly of the first class of evils, of the

pecuniary loss and personal inconvenience, which disabling statutes produce, they might be anxious that some relief should be procured, even if entire relief could not be obtained for them. But since they complain, chiefly, that an unmerited stigma is fixed upon them, since they complain that their fellow-man makes their faith a matter of his cognizance, and chastises them, whose conduct as citizens has always been exemplary, for adherence to the opinions of their forefathers ; they cannot desire any imperfect concessions ; they cannot desire that any pecuniary or personal advantage should be purchased for them by the sacrifice of the great rules of legislation, which form the firmest basis of their claims.

They feel that their right to be relieved at all, depends upon the position, that the State cannot without injustice deprive any class or classes of loyal and useful subjects, of the privileges which are enjoyed by the rest. If this position is false, it is just as reasonable,—if true, it is just as unreasonable,—to exclude the Jews from Parliament, as to deny to them the humblest office in a Corporation. Nor do I perceive how those, who during their whole political life have contended against restrictions upon belief, as improper and worse than useless, can consistently

abandon the high ground which they have hitherto occupied, and in exchange for the grant to any particular body of men of this or that privilege, consent to barter away the important principles of religious freedom.

The Jews have of course no power to accept or reject any measure which the Legislature may be pleased to enact respecting them.—But, for the reasons I have stated, I do earnestly request those, who have advocated and will again advocate our cause in Parliament, not to yield to any imperfect concession an assent, from which it might be inferred that they or that our community would be gratified, even for a moment, with any measure less extensive than our perfect equalization with other Dissenters. I request our friends, the friends of liberty of conscience, to consider, that if a portion only were removed of the disabilities which oppress us, and of which they almost equally with us desire the utter abolition, it would be implied that Parliament approved those restrictions of which the abrogation was neglected, and thus a change designed to strike off a part of our fetters would but rivet more firmly those which it left us to bear.

I should thus express my conviction of the worthlessness of incomplete relief, even if I supposed our entire enfranchisement to be a distant and uncertain event. But I am unable to believe this. For although I am fully aware how much more ably the arguments here examined might be refuted than I have refuted them, yet I place sufficient trust in the strength of my cause, to ask with confidence any dispassionate reader, who may previously have been led by any of these arguments into a doubt of the propriety of granting what we wish, whether he be not now convinced of their utter futility.

Since then these arguments, or arguments still feebler than these, have been alone openly employed against us ; and since the only intelligible reason for disregarding our prayers, which has been hinted at, though it has never been plainly avowed, consists in our *want of sufficient influence to make attention to them a matter of necessity*,—I cannot, I repeat it, wrong my countrymen by believing, that this single reason will prevent, or even further delay, our attainment of the object of our wishes. It is impossible to suppose that a community, whose principles inculcate, and whose conduct has always displayed, loyalty and

patriotism, will continue to be punished for that conduct, and stigmatized for those principles, by degrading exclusions.

Although, therefore, our earliest effort was unsuccessful, we have no ground for despair. Although our claim were rejected by Parliament, when they were for the first time submitted to its notice, and when consequently some prejudices and mis-apprehensions still remained to be removed, yet now, when enough of time has been afforded for fully understanding the justice of our wishes, we may make, with the firmest confidence, our second appeal to the Legislature. And with fully equal confidence may we again approach the tribunal of general opinion, and in the old language of the English law, “put ourselves upon the country.”

A P P E N D I X.

No. I.

IN a discussion which took place in the Chamber of Deputies on the 4th of December 1830, respecting a proposed law for granting to the religious teachers of the Jews salaries from the public Treasury, which are enjoyed in France by the ministers of all Christian sects, Mr. Merilhou, the Minister of Public Instruction and Ecclesiastical Affairs, said :

“I cannot conceive the reason of the opposition the project has met with. The Charter has spoken, it must be executed. All Christian creeds are acknowledged by it ; the Jewish has a right to claim the same protection and support. The Israelites of our days must not be confounded with that unfortunate class of former times—unfortunate, because it was persecuted,—for oppression has always the effect of debasing its victims. They are no longer in France, at least, given up exclusively to usury, because they were then, as was the case before the Revolution of 1789, denied the possibility of being any thing else, being excluded from all liberal professions. The blame must rest solely with their persecutors. But since the Constituent Assembly has placed the Israelites on a footing with other

citizens, they have partaken of our glory and misfortunes, their blood has flowed on the same fields of battle as ours, their children have been brought up in the same schools with those of their Christian brethren, they have imbibed the same principles, adopted the same habits, and have become most deserving citizens. Let us, then, destroy prejudices and laws worthy of the middle ages, and call the Jewish clergy to partake of the same advantages which the ministers of all Christian sects possess."

The speech of Mr. Salverte, which is reported most fully in the *Courier* of Thursday, December 9, 1830, was as follows :—

"All men are equal in the eyes of the law—this is the doctrine of the Charter. All men are equal before God—this is the doctrine of the Gospel. The Jews, equal in France, in the eyes of the law, subjected to the same duties as the other citizens, have a right that their religion should enjoy the same advantages. The law, in fine, is more political than financial. The Jews have been represented as men apart and hostile to other religions. Persecution, indeed, formerly made them so, but that condition ceased with the persecution. The spirit of separation is founded, we are again told, in their religion. That might have been true in the days of Moses, but in the mingling with different nations this spirit of separation became extinct. They have had a country when the country has wished for them. I support the proposition."

The law was adopted by 211 votes,—against 71.

No. II.

THE following list of Jews holding and having held offices in the United States, which appeared in a letter recently published by Mr. Benjamin Hart of Montreal, Lower Canada, omits the name of a Jewish Member of Congress, and some other names contained in the list subjoined to Mr. Van Oven's "Appeal to the British Nation on behalf of the Jews." It furnishes, however, some names which Mr. Van Oven's list does not comprise, and I have therefore subjoined it.

"Mordecai Sheftall, of Savannah, State of Georgia, was during the revolutionary war elected one of the Committee of Common Safety; Moses Sheftall, his son, has been elected, on two occasions, a Member of the Legislature of the same State, and has been a Judge of the County Court; Levy Isaac Delyon, of the same State, a Member of the Legislature; Mordecai Myers, of the same State, is now, and has been for the last five years, a Member of the Legislature; Isaac Minis, of the same State, was a Member of the Legislature; Levy Myers was in 1796 a Member of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, afterwards appointed Apothecary General of the same State; Myer Moses in 1810 was a Member of the Legislature of the same State; Chapman Levy has several times served as a Member of the Legislature, and is now a Senator of the Senate of that State; Lyon Levy was Treasurer of the same State, and Franklin Moses is now Aid to the Governor of that State; Mordecai Myers, of New York, has represented

that great city in the Legislature of that State; Jacob Henry was a Member of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina; Samuel Judah was for several years, and is now, a Member of the Legislature of Indiana.

In 1790, Abraham Cohen was appointed Post Master for Georgetown, South Carolina, and held the situation until his death; Solomon Cohen was Collector of Taxes for the same State; Moses Myers was Prothonotary of Georgetown, and Myer Moses was one of the Council of Safety for Charlestown, in the same State; Jacob I. Cohen was Recorder of the city of Richmond, in Virginia; Jacob Cohen is a Member of the Council of the city of Baltimore; Barnet Henry is the United States Consul at Gibraltar; Benjamin Russell at Riga; and Mordecai M. Noah was the United States Consul at Tunis,—after his return he was appointed Sheriff of the city of New York, and is now Surveyor of that Port (one of the most respectable situations in that State, and involving high responsibilities); Moses Myers, of Norfolk, Virginia, is Collector of the Customs, and John Myers, Deputy Collector; Reuben Etting was Marshal of the State of Maryland.

Persons who are, or have been commissioned in the Naval and Military Forces of the United States :—

Colonel David Franks, the Confidential Aid of General Washington, till his death, and with whom he served during the Revolutionary War; after the Peace of Independence he was appointed Cashier of the United States Bank in Philadelphia.

Myer Moses, Major and Deputy Quarter Master General; Lieut. Mordecai Myers, Aid to the Governor; Chapman Levy, Captain; Mordecai Myers, Captain; G. Waage,

Major ; Abraham Massias, Major ; Hymon Cohen, Lieutenant ; Phillip Minis and Abraham Deleon, Surgeons of the Army.

In the Navy.—Uriah Levy, Esq. Lieutenant and Commander ; Barnet Henry, Esq. was a Lieutenant ; Emanuel Phillips was Surgeon ; and Gratz Etting, Purser.”

THE END.

PRINTED BY RICHARD TAYLOR,
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON,
RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.